

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 22 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 17, and 18 have been amended.

The final Action mailed on February 16, 2006, rejected claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 4,964,017 to Jindrick et al. ("Jindrick"). Claims 4, 14, and 15 were rejected under Section 103(a) for obviousness over a combination of Jindrick and U.S. Patent No. 6,151,206 to Kato et al. ("Kato"). Claim 5 was rejected for obviousness over a combination of Jindrick and U.S. Patent No. 6,697,262 to Adams et al. ("Adams"). Claims 11 and 13 were rejected for obviousness over a combination of Jindrick and U.S. Patent No. 6,661,677 to Rumney ("Rumney"). Claims 18-20 and 22 were rejected under Section 102(e) for anticipation by Rumney.

The Examiner's courtesy during the telephone interview with the undersigned on April 25, 2006, is gratefully acknowledged. During the interview, claim 1 and Jindrick were discussed. Although agreement was not reached with respect to claim 1, the undersigned believes that agreement was reached on several differences between Jindrick and subject matter described in the application. It is respectfully submitted that those differences are reflected in the amended independent claims.

As pointed out previously, the claims define methods and apparatus that address, among other things, a problem with crowded remote terminal (RT) cabinets for telecommunications. Claim 1 defines an apparatus that includes a housing attachable to a portion of a surface and having a channel covered by a cover panel opposite the portion of the surface and at least one mounting member on the housing for attaching the housing to the surface.

As currently amended, claim 1 also provides that the cover panel is sized to the channel, and a slot extends between the cover panel and the portion of the surface that is capable of receiving the at least one module and is sized to guide the at least one module into the slot and the channel, the at least one module being retained between the surface and the cover panel in at least partial contact with the surface. Comparable recitations have been included in the other independent claims.

It should be apparent that neither Jindrick nor Rumney (with respect to independent method claim 18 and its dependent claims) discloses slots, channels,

cover panels, and methods involving same as claimed. For example, Jindrick's panel 28 is not sized to its card guide 58B and cage 40 and does not hold its board 59 against a surface. Rumney is no better than Jindrick in that it neither teaches nor would have suggested using a cover panel sized to a channel, and a slot that extends between the cover panel and a portion of the surface that is capable of receiving the at least one module and is sized to guide the at least one module into the slot and the channel, the at least one module being held against the surface by the cover panel.

Because Jindrick does not disclose all of the features of independent claims 1, 7, and 17 arranged as in those claims, Jindrick cannot be said to anticipate those claims or any of claims 2, 3, 6, 8-10, 12, or 16 that depend on respective ones of them. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the anticipation rejections based on Jindrick be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Similarly, because Rumney does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 18 arranged as in that claim, Rumney cannot be said to anticipate claim 18 or any of claims 19, 20, and 22 that depend on it. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the anticipation rejections based on Rumney be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to the obviousness rejections of claims 4, 5, 11, and 13-15 over a combination of Jindrick and different ones of Kato, Adams, and Rumney, it has been previously pointed out that Kato merely appears to describe accessories that can be connected to other devices, such as laptop computers, that Adams appears to describe a device for mounting electronics in the dashboard of a vehicle, and that Rumney describes a disk drive cage. Thus, none of Kato, Adams, and Rumney supplies the features that are absent from Jindrick as described above with respect to claim 1, for example. Moreover, Kato and Adams at least say nothing about and would be unusable with the computer housings described in Jindrick.

Because no combination of Jindrick and Kato, Adams, or Rumney discloses all of the features recited by the rejected claims, and there appears to be no reasonable motivation to combine such disparate documents, the cited documents are insufficient as bases for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early Notice of same is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions, the undersigned attorney may be telephoned at the number given below.

Potomac Patent Group PLLC
P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
Tel: 919 677 9591
Filed May 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael G. Savage/

Michael G. Savage
Registration No. 32,596